arXiv:1211.2879v1 [math.DG] 13 Nov 2012

# A Simple Method for the Optimal Transportation

Xian-Tao Huang[1]

## Abstract

In this paper we will give a new proof of the monotonicity of Wasserstein distances of two diffusions under super Ricci flow. Our proof is based on the coupling method of B.Andrew and J.Clutterbuck (see [2]). The same method can also be applied to the contractivity of normalized $\mathscr{L}$-Wasserstein distance under backward Ricci flow.

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification*: 53C44

*Keywords*: MongeCKantorovich problem, super Ricci flow, Ricci flow, $\mathscr{L}$-distance.

## 1 Introduction

Suppose $M$ is a compact oriented Riemannian manifold with dimension $n$. Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathbf{P(M)}$ be two Borel probability measures on $M$. Let $c : M \times M \to \mathbf{R} \bigcup \{+\infty\}$ be a lower semi-continuous cost function. One can consider the MongeCKantorovich minimization problem:

$$\mathrm{T}_c(\mu, \nu) = \inf_{\pi \in \Gamma(\mu,\nu)} \int_{M \times M} c(x, y) d\pi(x, y),$$

where $\Gamma(\mu, \nu)$ is the set of Borel probability measures $\pi$ on $M \times M$ which have marginals $\mu$ and $\nu$ (i.e. $\pi(A \times M) = \mu(A), \pi(M \times A) = \nu(A)$ for Borel set

---

[1] Department of Mathematics, Sun Yat-sen University, 510275, Guangzhou, People's Republic of China.

E-mail address: *hxiant@mail2.sysu.edu.cn*

$A \subseteq M$). In particular, when $c(x,y) = d^p(x,y)$, we have the $p$-Wasserstein distance ($p > 0$) between $\mu$ and $\nu$:

$$W_p(\mu,\nu) = \left( \inf_{\pi \in \Gamma(\mu,\nu)} \int_{M \times M} d^p(x,y) d\pi(x,y) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

There are lots of work concerning the characterizations of manifolds with Ricci curvature bounded from below, see [9] [12] [13] and the references therein. Some of these characterizations were made by using the optimal transportation. For example, in [12], Sturm and von Renesse proved that the condition $Ric(M) \geq K$ is equivalent to the monotonically nonincreasing in $t$ of $e^{Kt} W_p(\mu(t), \nu(t))$ for all $p \in [1, \infty]$, where $\mu(t), \nu(t)$ are two solutions of the heat equation.

The above papers all considered manifolds with static metrics. McCann and Topping [10] first considered the equivalent properties of super Ricci flow, i.e. a smooth family of metrics $g(\tau)$, $\tau \in [\tau_1, \tau_2]$, parameterized backward in time, on a compact oriented n-dimensional manifold $M$, satisfying

$$-\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} g(\tau) + 2Ric(g(\tau)) \geq 0. \tag{1}$$

Let $\mu(\tau)$, $\tau \in (\tau_1, \tau_2)$, be a family of probability measures with $d\mu(\tau) = u(\cdot, \tau) dV_{g(\tau)}$ such that $u$ satisfies the conjugate heat equation

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \tau} = \Delta_{g(\tau)} u - \left( \frac{1}{2} tr \frac{\partial g}{\partial \tau} \right) u. \tag{2}$$

For brevity, we will refer to such a family simply as a diffusion as in [14] throughout this paper. We will often abuse the notation of the probability $\mu$ and the volume form $d\mu$ for simplicity.

One can consider the problem of optimal transportation of two diffusions $d\mu(\tau) = u(\cdot, \tau) dV_\tau$, $d\nu(\tau) = v(\cdot, \tau) dV_\tau$. Let $c : \mathbf{R}^+ \times \mathbf{R}^+ \to \mathbf{R}^+$ be a smooth function with $c(0, \tau) = 0$. The corresponding MongeCKantorovich minimization problem is denoted by

$$\mathrm{T}_c(\mu(\tau), \nu(\tau), \tau) = \inf_{\pi \in \Gamma(\mu(\tau), \nu(\tau))} \int_{M \times M} c(d_\tau(x,y), \tau) d\pi(x,y), \tag{3}$$

where $d_\tau(x,y)$ means the distance between $x$ and $y$ with respect to $g(\tau)$. The corresponding $p$-Wasserstein distance ($p > 0$) between $\mu(\tau)$ and $\nu(\tau)$ is denoted by $W_p(\mu(\tau),\nu(\tau),\tau)$.

In [10], the authors proved the 2-Wasserstein contractivity under super Ricci flow by calculating the derivatives of the entropy along Wasserstein geodesics. J.Lott [8] gave a new proof of the 2-Wasserstein contractivity under Ricci flow. The 1-Wasserstein contractivity was proved by Tom Ilmanen, see [4]. The monotonicity results were extended to a more general class of cost functions by M.Arnaudon, K.A.Coulibaly and A.Thalmaier [3] using probabilistic method.

One of the purposes of this paper is to give a direct proof of the monotonicity results in [3]. Our main theorem is as follows:

**Theorem 1.1.** *If $g(\tau)$ satisfies*

$$-\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}g(\tau) + 2Ric(g(\tau)) \geq 2Kg(\tau), \tag{4}$$

*$\mu(\tau) = u(x,\tau)dV_\tau$, $\nu(\tau) = v(y,\tau)dV_\tau$ are two diffusions, furthermore $c : \mathbf{R}^+ \times \mathbf{R}^+ \to \mathbf{R}^+$ satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} c(0,\tau) = 0, \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial x}c(x,\tau) \geq 0, \\ -\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}c(x,\tau) + Kx\frac{\partial}{\partial x}c(x,\tau) - \min\left\{4\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}c(x,\tau), 0\right\} \geq 0, \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

*then $\mathrm{T}_c(\mu(\tau),\nu(\tau),\tau)$ is nonincreasing in $\tau$.*

As a corollary, if $K = 0$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}c(x,\tau) = 0$, we have

**Corollary 1.2.** *If $g(\tau)$ satisfies* (1)*, $\mu(\tau)$, $\nu(\tau)$ are two diffusions, the function $c : \mathbf{R}^+ \to \mathbf{R}^+$ satisfies $c(0) = 0, c' \geq 0$, then $\mathrm{T}_c(\mu(\tau),\nu(\tau),\tau)$ is nonincreasing in $\tau$.*

For general $K$, if we choose $c(x,\tau) = e^{pK\tau}x^p$ for some $p > 0$, then the conditions (5) are all satisfied. Notice that in this case,

$$e^{K\tau}W_p(\mu(\tau),\nu(\tau),\tau) = \{T_c(\mu(\tau),\nu(\tau),\tau)\}^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

we have

**Corollary 1.3.** *If $g(\tau)$, $\mu(\tau)$, $\nu(\tau)$ are the same as in Theorem 1.1, then $e^{K\tau}W_p(\mu(\tau),\nu(\tau),\tau)$ $(p>0)$ is nonincreasing in $\tau$.*

**Remark 1.4.** *If the family of metrics is fixed, one can recover the corresponding monotonicity of Wasserstein distances for manifolds with Ricci curvature bounded from below, which was proved by Sturm and von Renesse [12].*

**Remark 1.5.** *Corollary 1.2 and Corollary 1.3 were proved originally by probabilistic method in [3].*

The method we use here originated from B.Andrew and J.Clutterbuck's papers [1] [2]. They have used this method to bound the modulus of continuity of solutions of various parabolic equations. We will construct an operator that can be interpreted as a coupling of two Laplacians, and use the parabolic maximum principle in our argument.

There is an analogous notion of $\mathscr{L}$-Wasserstein distance introduced by Topping in [14].

Suppose we have the backward Ricci flow, $\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}g(\tau)=2Ric(g(\tau))$, defined on an open interval $I$ containing $[\bar{\tau}_1,\bar{\tau}_2]$, where $0<\bar{\tau}_1<\bar{\tau}_2$. Perelman's $\mathscr{L}$-length of a smooth curve $\gamma:[\tau_1,\tau_2]\to M$ $([\tau_1,\tau_2]\subseteq I)$ is defined to be

$$\mathscr{L}(\gamma):=\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2}\sqrt{\tau}(R(\gamma(\tau),\tau)+|\gamma'(\tau)|^2_{g(\tau)})d\tau.$$

The $\mathscr{L}$-distance between a pair of points $(x,\tau_1)$ and $(y,\tau_2)$ is defined to be

$$Q(x,\tau_1;y,\tau_2):=inf\left\{\mathscr{L}(\gamma)|\gamma:[\tau_1,\tau_2]\to M\text{ is smooth, }\gamma(\tau_1)=x,\gamma(\tau_2)=y\right\}.$$

One can also consider the notion of $\mathscr{L}$-Wasserstein distance $V(v_1,\tau_1;v_2,\tau_2)$ between two diffusions $\nu_1(\tau)$ and $\nu_2(\tau)$:

$$V(\nu_1(\tau_1),\tau_1;\nu_2(\tau_2),\tau_2):=\inf_{\pi\in\Gamma(\nu_1(\tau_1),\nu_2(\tau_2))}\int_{M\times M}Q(x,\tau_1;y,\tau_2)d\pi(x,y).$$

Now let $\tau_1 = \tau_1(s) := \bar{\tau}_1 e^s$, $\tau_2 = \tau_2(s) := \bar{\tau}_2 e^s$ be two exponential functions of $s \in \mathbf{R}$, and define the normalized distance between the diffusions $\nu_1$ and $\nu_2$ at $s$ by

$$\Theta(s) := 2(\sqrt{\tau_1} - \sqrt{\tau_2})V(v_1(\tau_1), \tau_1; v_2(\tau_2), \tau_2) - 2n(\sqrt{\tau_1} - \sqrt{\tau_2})^2$$

for $s$ in a neighborhood of 0 such that $v_i(\tau_i(s))$ are defined $(i = 1, 2)$.

Topping gave the following theorem in [14]:

**Theorem 1.6** (Topping)**.** *$\Theta(s)$ is a nonincreasing function of $s$.*

K.Kuwada and R.Philipowski gave a new proof basing on probabilistic method in [7]. We find that our new method also apply to this problem, see Section 4 for details.

**Acknowledgments**.The author would like to express his gratitude to his advisor Professor Bing-Long Chen, who brought him this topic and gave him lots of enlightening discussions and encouragement.

## 2 A coupling method

In this Section, we will define an operator $\mathscr{D}$ which can be viewed as a coupling of two Laplacians, and calculate the action of $\mathscr{D}$ on $c(d_\tau(x, y), \tau)$.

Let $\Omega$ be the set $M \times M \backslash \{(x, x) | x \in M\}$, denote the product metric $g_\tau \times g_\tau$ on $\Omega$ by $\tilde{g}_\tau$. Let $\tilde{\nabla}_\tau$, $\tilde{\nabla}^2_\tau$ denote the gradient and Hessian with respect to $\tilde{g}_\tau$ respectively.

The set $\mathscr{F}_\tau \subset Sym_2(T^*\Omega)$ is defined to be

$$\mathscr{F}_\tau := \Big\{ A \in Sym_2(T^*\Omega) \Big| A \geq 0, A_{(x,y)}|_{Sym_2(T^*_x M)} = g_\tau(x), \\ A_{(x,y)}|_{Sym_2(T^*_y M)} = g_\tau(y) \Big\},$$

i.e. the elements of $\mathscr{F}_\tau$ are couplings of $g_\tau(x)$ and $g_\tau(y)$. Define the operator $\mathscr{D}_\tau : C^2(\Omega) \to C^0(\Omega)$ to be

$$\mathscr{D}_\tau(f) := \inf\left\{ tr(A(\tilde{\nabla}^2_\tau(f))) \middle| A \in \mathscr{F}_\tau \right\}$$

for $f \in C^2(\Omega)$. When $f$ is independent of $x$, $\mathscr{D}_\tau(f) = \Delta_{g(\tau)} f(y)$. When $f$ is independent of $y$, $\mathscr{D}_\tau(f) = \Delta_{g(\tau)} f(x)$. Therefore $\mathscr{D}_\tau$ is a coupling of $\Delta_{g(\tau)|_x}$ and $\Delta_{g(\tau)|_y}$.

Let $x, y \in M, x \neq y$, and $d = d_\tau(x, y)$. Let $\gamma : [-\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2}] \to M$ be a minimizing geodesic from $x$ to $y$, parameterized by arc length in $(M, g(\tau))$. Choose an orthonormal basis $\{E_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ for $T_x M$, such that $E_n = \gamma'(-\frac{d}{2})$. Parallel transportation along $\gamma$ gives an orthonormal basis $\{E_i(s)\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ for $T_{\gamma(s)} M$ with $E_n(s) = \gamma'(s)$. Sometimes we also denote $E_n(s)$ by $X(s)$.

It is obvious that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{D}_\tau f \leq & min\Big\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{\nabla}^2 f((E_i(-\frac{d}{2}), E_i(\frac{d}{2})), (E_i(-\frac{d}{2}), E_i(\frac{d}{2}))), \\ & \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \tilde{\nabla}^2 f((E_i(-\frac{d}{2}), E_i(\frac{d}{2})), (E_i(-\frac{d}{2}), E_i(\frac{d}{2}))) \\ & + \tilde{\nabla}^2 f((E_n(-\frac{d}{2}), -E_n(\frac{d}{2})), (E_n(-\frac{d}{2}), -E_n(\frac{d}{2}))) \Big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where the inequality holds in support sense.

Throughout this paper, the derivative of a Lipschitz function $\frac{d^+}{d\tau} f(\tau)$ is interpreted as

$$\frac{d^+}{d\tau} f(\tau) = \limsup_{h \downarrow 0} \frac{f(\tau + h) - f(\tau)}{h}.$$

We will denote the $x, \tau$ derivatives of $c(x, \tau)$ by $c', \dot{c}$ respectively for brevity.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let $(M, g_\tau)$ satisfies (4), $c : \mathbf{R}^+ \times \mathbf{R}^+ \to \mathbf{R}^+$ satisfies $c'(x, \tau) \geq 0$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} (-\frac{d^+}{d\tau} - \mathscr{D}_\tau) c(d_\tau(x, y), \tau) \geq & -\dot{c}(d_\tau(x, y), \tau) + K d_\tau(x, y) c'(d_\tau(x, y), \tau) \\ & - min\{4c''(d_\tau(x, y), \tau), 0\} \end{aligned}$$

*for $(x, y) \in \Omega$.*

***Proof:*** Let $\gamma : [-\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2}] \to M$ be any minimizing geodesic connecting $x$ and $y$ parameterized by arc length in $(M, g(\tau))$. Let $\{E_i(s)\}_{1\leq i\leq n}$ be a parallel orthonormal basis for $T_{\gamma(s)}M$ with $E_n(s) = \gamma'(s)$. For $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n-1\}$, let $\gamma_i : (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \times [-\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2}] \to M$ be the variation $\gamma_i(r, s) = \exp_{\gamma(s)}(rE_i)$, then

$$d_\tau(\exp_x(rE_i), exp_y(rE_i)) \leq L_\tau[\gamma_i(r, \cdot)]$$

with equality holds at $r = 0$, where $L_\tau[\gamma]$ means the length of a curve $\gamma$ with respect to $g(\tau)$. Since $c(x, \tau)$ is nondecreasing in the space variable, we have

$$c(d_\tau(\exp_x(rE_i), exp_y(rE_i)), \tau) \leq c(L_\tau[\gamma_i(r, \cdot)], \tau)$$

with equality holds at $r = 0$. By the first variation formula,

$$\frac{d}{dr}\bigg|_{r=0} L_\tau[\gamma_i(r, \cdot)] = 0.$$

By the second variation formula,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d^2}{dr^2}\bigg|_{r=0} L_\tau[\gamma_i(r, \cdot)] \\
=&\int_{-\frac{d}{2}}^{\frac{d}{2}} \{|\nabla_{\gamma'} E_i|^2 - R(\gamma', E_i, E_i, \gamma') - (\frac{\partial}{\partial s}\langle E_i, \gamma'\rangle)^2\} ds + \langle \nabla_{E_i} E_i, \gamma'\rangle\bigg|_{-\frac{d}{s}}^{\frac{d}{s}} \\
=&-\int_{-\frac{d}{2}}^{\frac{d}{2}} R(\gamma', E_i, E_i, \gamma') ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \tilde{\nabla}^2 c(d_\tau(x, y), \tau)((E_i, E_i), (E_i, E_i)) \\
\leq&\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{d^2}{dr^2}\bigg|_{r=0} c(L_\tau[\gamma_i(r, \cdot)], \tau) \\
=&\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left[c''\left(\frac{d}{dr}\bigg|_{r=0} L_\tau\right)^2 + c' \frac{d^2}{dr^2}\bigg|_{r=0} L_\tau\right] \\
=&-c' \int_{-\frac{d}{2}}^{\frac{d}{2}} Ric(X, X) ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Similarly, if we extend $\gamma$ a little to get a longer geodesic, which we will still denote by $\gamma : [-\frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2} + \delta] \to M$, then

$$d_\tau(\gamma(-\frac{d}{2} + r), \gamma(\frac{d}{2} + r)) \leq L_\tau[\gamma|_{(-\frac{d}{2}+r, \frac{d}{2}+r)}] \equiv d$$

with equality holds at $r = 0$. Therefore

$$c(d_\tau(\gamma(-\frac{d}{2} + r), \gamma(\frac{d}{2} + r)), \tau) \leq c(d, \tau).$$

Hence,

$$\tilde{\nabla}^2 c(d_\tau(x, y), \tau)((E_n, E_n), (E_n, E_n)) \leq 0. \tag{8}$$

It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\tilde{\nabla}^2 c(d_\tau(x, y), \tau)((E_n, -E_n), (E_n, -E_n)) \\ =&\frac{d^2}{dr^2}\bigg|_{r=0} c(d_\tau - 2r, \tau) = 4c''. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Combining (6), (7), (8), (9), we get

$$\mathscr{D}_\tau c(d_\tau(x, y), \tau) \leq -c' \int_{-\frac{d}{2}}^{\frac{d}{2}} Ric(\gamma', \gamma') ds + min\{4c'', 0\}. \tag{10}$$

On the other hand, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^+}{d\tau} d_\tau(x, y) &= \limsup_{h \downarrow 0} \frac{d_{\tau+h}(x, y) - d_\tau(x, y)}{h} \\ &\leq \limsup_{h \downarrow 0} \frac{L_{\tau+h}[\gamma] - L_\tau[\gamma]}{h} \\ &= \frac{d}{d\tau} L_\tau[\gamma] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\frac{d}{2}}^{\frac{d}{2}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} g(X, X) ds. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Therefore

$$-\frac{d^+}{d\tau} c(d_\tau(x, y), \tau) = c' \left( -\frac{d^+}{d\tau} d_\tau(x, y) \right) - \dot{c} \tag{12}$$

$$\geq \frac{c'}{2}\Big(\int_{-\frac{d}{2}}^{\frac{d}{2}} -\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} g(X,X)ds\Big) - \dot{c}.$$

Combining (10), (12), we find

$$\begin{aligned}&(-\frac{d^+}{d\tau} - \mathscr{D}_\tau)c(d_\tau(x,y),\tau)\\ \geq &\frac{c'}{2}\int_{-\frac{d}{2}}^{\frac{d}{2}}\Big(-\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}g + 2Ric\Big)(X,X)ds - \dot{c} - min\{4c'',0\}\\ \geq &Kdc' - \dot{c} - min\{4c'',0\}.\end{aligned}$$

So we have completed the proof.

## 3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

The following lemma of Kantorovich duality is well known to the experts.

**Lemma 3.1** (Kantorovich duality, see [15])**.** *Suppose $M$ is a manifold. Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathbf{P(M)}$. Let $c : M \times M \to \mathbf{R}\bigcup\{+\infty\}$ be a lower semi-continuous cost function. Define*

$$J(\varphi,\psi) = \int_M \varphi d\mu + \int_M \psi d\nu \tag{13}$$

*for $(\varphi,\psi) \in L^1(d\mu)\times L^1(d\nu)$. Let $\Phi_c$ be the set of all $(\varphi,\psi) \in L^1(d\mu)\times L^1(d\nu)$ satisfying*

$$\phi(x) + \psi(y) \leq c(x,y) \tag{14}$$

*for $d\mu$ almost all $x \in M$, $d\nu$ almost all $y \in M$. Then*

$$\mathrm{T}_c(\mu,\nu) = \sup_{(\varphi,\psi)\in\Phi_c} J(\varphi,\psi). \tag{15}$$

A pair of functions $(\varphi,\psi)$ are said to be competitive if they satisfy $\phi(x)+\psi(y) \leq c(x,y)$.

***Proof of Theorem 1.1:*** Suppose $b \in (\tau_1, \tau_2)$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $(\alpha_b, \beta_b)$ such that $\alpha_b(x) + \beta_b(y) \leq c(d_b(x,y), b)$ and $J_b(\alpha_b, \beta_b) > T_c(\mu, \nu, b) - \epsilon$. We solve the equations

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \tau} = \Delta_{g(\tau)}\varphi, & \tau \in (\tau_1, b) \\ \varphi(x,b) = \alpha_b(x), \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

$$\begin{cases} -\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \tau} = \Delta_{g(\tau)}\psi, & \tau \in (\tau_1, b) \\ \psi(x,b) = \beta_b(x). \end{cases} \tag{17}$$

Since

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}\int_M \varphi u dV_\tau = \int_M \left[\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial \tau}u + \varphi(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \tau}) + \frac{1}{2}tr(\frac{\partial g}{\partial \tau})\varphi u\right] dV_\tau = 0$$

and $\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}\int_M \psi v dV_\tau = 0$, we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}J_\tau(\varphi(\cdot,\tau), \psi(\cdot,\tau)) = 0.$$

If we can prove $\varphi(x,\tau) + \psi(y,\tau) \leq c(d_\tau(x,y),\tau)$ for $\tau \in (\tau_1, b)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} T_c(\mu,\nu,b) \leq & J_b(\alpha_b, \beta_b) + \epsilon \\ = & J_\tau(\varphi_\tau, \psi_\tau) + \epsilon \\ \leq & T_c(\mu,\nu,\tau) + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

By the arbitrariness of $\epsilon$, we have $T_c(\mu,\nu,b) \leq T_c(\mu,\nu,\tau), \forall \tau \in (\tau_1, b)$, i.e. $T_c(\mu,\nu,\tau)$ is nonincreasing in $\tau$.

In the following, we will prove $\varphi(x,\tau) + \psi(y,\tau) \leq c(d_\tau(x,y),\tau)$ for $\tau \in (\tau_1, b)$. Define an evolving quantity $Z$ on $M \times M \times (\tau_1, b)$:

$$Z(x,y,\tau) = \varphi(x,\tau) + \psi(y,\tau) - c(d_\tau(x,y),\tau) + \epsilon(\tau - b - 1).$$

Notice that since $c(x,\tau)$ satisfies (5), we have $(-\frac{d^+}{d\tau} - \mathscr{D}_\tau)c \geq 0$ by Lemma 2.1.

We now apply the operator $-\frac{d^+}{d\tau} - \mathscr{D}_\tau$ to $Z$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(-\frac{d^+}{d\tau} - \mathscr{D}_\tau)Z(x,y,\tau) \\
=&-\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}\varphi(x,\tau) - \frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}\psi(y,\tau) + \frac{d^+}{d\tau}c(d_\tau(x,y),\tau) - \epsilon \\
&-\Delta_{g(\tau)}\varphi(x,t) - \Delta_{g(\tau)}\psi(y,\tau) + \mathscr{D}_\tau c(d_\tau(x,y),\tau) \\
=&-\epsilon + (\frac{d^+}{d\tau} + \mathscr{D}_\tau)c(d_\tau(x,y),\tau) \\
\leq&-\epsilon < 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

By assumption, we have $Z(x,y,b) \leq -\epsilon < 0$. On the other hand, let $f(x,\tau) = \varphi(x,\tau) + \psi(x,\tau)$, then $f$ satisfies $-\frac{\partial f}{\partial\tau} = \Delta_{g(\tau)}f$, with $f(x,b) = \varphi(x,b) + \psi(x,b) \leq c(0,b) = 0$. By maximum principle, we have $f(x,\tau) \leq 0 = c(0,\tau), \forall\tau \in (\tau_1, b)$. So $Z(x,x,\tau) < 0, \forall\tau \in (\tau_1, b)$. It follows that if $Z$ ever becomes positive, then there exists a maximal $\tau_0 < b$ and $x_0 \neq y_0$ in $M$ such that $Z(x_0,y_0,\tau_0) = 0$. Then at $(x_0,y_0,\tau_0)$,

$$\frac{d^+}{d\tau}Z \leq 0, \qquad \mathscr{D}_\tau Z \leq 0.$$

Therefore, $(-\frac{d^+}{d\tau} - \mathscr{D}_\tau)Z(x_0,y_0,\tau_0) \geq 0$. We get a contradiction. So $Z(x,y,\tau) \leq 0$. By the arbitrariness of $\epsilon$, we get $\varphi(x,\tau) + \psi(y,\tau) \leq c(d_\tau(x,y),\tau)$ and finish the proof.

## 4 $\mathscr{L}$-optimal transportation

Before starting our new proof of Theorem 1.6, we recall some basic theory of Perelman's $\mathscr{L}$-length. The readers can refer to [5] [6] [11] for more details and further results. Suppose we have the backward Ricci flow, $\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}g(\tau) = 2Ric(g(\tau))$, defined on an open interval $I$ containing $[\bar\tau_1, \bar\tau_2]$. For a curve $\gamma : [\tau_1, \tau_2] \to M$, denote $X(\tau) = \gamma'(\tau)$, and let $Y(\tau)$ be a smooth vector field along $\gamma(\tau)$. The first variation formula of $\mathscr{L}$-length is:

$$\delta_Y[\mathscr{L}] = 2\sqrt{\tau}\langle X, Y\rangle\Big|_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} + \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \sqrt{\tau}\langle Y, \nabla R - 2\nabla_X X - 4Ric(\cdot, X) - \frac{1}{\tau}X\rangle d\tau,$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the inner product with respect to $g(\tau)$.

A smooth curve $\gamma(\tau)$ in M is called an $\mathscr{L}$-geodesic if it satisfies the following $\mathscr{L}$-geodesic equation:

$$2\nabla_X X - \nabla R + 4Ric(\cdot, X) + \frac{1}{\tau} X = 0. \tag{18}$$

Suppose $\gamma : [\tau_1, \tau_2] \to M$ is a shortest $\mathscr{L}$-geodesic connecting $(x, \tau_1)$ and $(y, \tau_2)$. For $(\hat{x}, \hat{\tau}_1)$, $(\hat{y}, \hat{\tau}_2)$ near $(x, \tau_1)$ and $(y, \tau_2)$ respectively, denote $\gamma_{(\hat{x}, \hat{\tau}_1; \hat{y}, \hat{\tau}_2)}$ the $\mathscr{L}$-geodesic connecting $(\hat{x}, \hat{\tau}_1)$ and $(\hat{y}, \hat{\tau}_2)$ near $\gamma$, denote $\mathscr{L}(\hat{x}, \hat{\tau}_1; \hat{y}, \hat{\tau}_2)$ the $\mathscr{L}$-length of $\gamma_{(\hat{x}, \hat{\tau}_1; \hat{y}, \hat{\tau}_2)}$, then $\mathscr{L}(\hat{x}, \hat{\tau}_1; \hat{y}, \hat{\tau}_2) \geq Q(\hat{x}, \hat{\tau}_1; \hat{y}, \hat{\tau}_2)$, with equality holds when $(\hat{x}, \hat{\tau}_1; \hat{y}, \hat{\tau}_2) = (x, \tau_1; y, \tau_2)$. By the first variation formula, we find

$$\nabla_1 \mathscr{L}(x, \tau_1; y, \tau_2) = -2\sqrt{\tau_1} X(\tau_1), \tag{19}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_1} \mathscr{L}(x, \tau_1; y, \tau_2) &= \frac{d}{d\tau_1}\Big|_{\tau = \tau_1} \mathscr{L}(\gamma(\tau), \tau; y, \tau_2) - \nabla_{X(\tau_1)} \mathscr{L}(\gamma(\tau), \tau; y, \tau_2) \\ &= \sqrt{\tau_1}(|X(\tau_1)|^2 - R(x, \tau_1)). \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Similarly,

$$\nabla_2 \mathscr{L}(x, \tau_1; y, \tau_2) = 2\sqrt{\tau_2} X(\tau_2), \tag{21}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_2} \mathscr{L}(x, \tau_1; y, \tau_2) = -\sqrt{\tau_2}(|X(\tau_2)|^2 - R(y, \tau_2)). \tag{22}$$

On the other hand, by the $\mathscr{L}$-geodesic equation (18), we easily get

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}[R(\gamma(\tau), \tau) + |X(\tau)|^2] = -H(X) - \frac{1}{\tau}[R(\gamma(\tau), \tau) + |X(\tau)|^2]$$

where $H(X)$ is the Hamilton Harnack quantity

$$H(X) := -R_\tau - \frac{1}{\tau} R - 2\langle \nabla R, X \rangle + 2Ric(X, X).$$

Multiplying both sides by $\tau^{\frac{3}{2}}$, integrating, and by integrating the left-hand side by parts, we find

(23)
$$\tau_2^{\frac{3}{2}}[R(y,\tau_2)+|X(\tau_2)|^2]-\tau_1^{\frac{3}{2}}[R(x,\tau_1)+|X(\tau_1)|^2]=-\mathscr{K}+\frac{1}{2}\mathscr{L}(x,\tau_1;y,\tau_2),$$

where $\mathscr{K}:=\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2}\tau^{\frac{3}{2}}H(X(\tau))d\tau$. Combining (20), (22), (23), we find

$$\begin{aligned}(24)\qquad &\tau_1\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau_1}\mathscr{L}(x,\tau_1;y,\tau_2)+\tau_2\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau_2}\mathscr{L}(x,\tau_1;y,\tau_2)\\ =&2\tau_2^{\frac{3}{2}}R(y,\tau_2)-2\tau_1^{\frac{3}{2}}R(x,\tau_1)+\mathscr{K}-\frac{1}{2}Q(x,\tau_1;y,\tau_2).\end{aligned}$$

Along a $\mathscr{L}$-geodesic $\gamma$, we have the second variation formula

$$\begin{aligned}(25)\qquad \delta_Y^2[\mathscr{L}]=2\sqrt{\tau}\langle\nabla_Y Y,X\rangle\Big|_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2}+\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2}\sqrt{\tau}\Big[&2|\nabla_X Y|^2+2\langle R(Y,X)Y,X\rangle\\ &+HessR(Y,Y)+2\nabla_X Ric(Y,Y)-4\nabla_Y Ric(Y,X)\Big]d\tau.\end{aligned}$$

We can now define an operator $\mathscr{D}$ which is a coupling of $\tau_1\Delta_{g_{\tau_1}(x)}$ and $\tau_2\Delta_{g_{\tau_2}(y)}$ as in section 2:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{D}(f(x,\tau_1;y,\tau_2)):=\inf\Big\{&tr(A(\tilde{\nabla}^2(f)))\Big|A\in Sym_2(T^*(M\times M)),A\geq 0,\\ &A_{(x,y)}|_{Sym_2(T_x^*M)}=\tau_1 g_{\tau_1}(x),A_{(x,y)}|_{Sym_2(T_y^*M)}=\tau_2 g_{\tau_2}(y)\Big\}\end{aligned}$$

for $f:M\times I\times M\times I\to\mathbf{R}$, where $\tilde{\nabla}^2$ means the Hessian with respect to the product metric of $g(\tau_1)$ and $g(\tau_2)$.

Suppose $\{Y_i\}_{1\leq i\leq n}$ is an basis at $\gamma(\tau_1)$ with $\langle Y_i,Y_j\rangle_{g(\tau_1)}=\tau_1\delta_{ij}$. We extend this basis along the $\mathscr{L}$-shortest geodesic $\gamma$ to get a family of basis $\{Y_i(\tau)\}_{1\leq i\leq n}$ by solving the ODEs

$$\nabla_X Y_i=-Ric(Y_i,\cdot)+\frac{1}{2\tau}Y_i.$$

From

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}\langle Y_i,Y_j\rangle=2Ric(Y_i,Y_j)+\langle\nabla_X Y_i,Y_j\rangle+\langle Y_i,\nabla_X Y_j\rangle=\frac{1}{\tau}\langle Y_i,Y_j\rangle,$$

it follows

$$\langle Y_i(\tau), Y_j(\tau)\rangle_{g(\tau)} = \tau\delta_{ij}.$$

By the definition of $\mathscr{D}$, we have

$$\mathscr{D}f \le \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{\nabla}^2 f((Y_i(\tau_1), Y_i(\tau_2)), (Y_i(\tau_1), Y_i(\tau_2))),$$

where the above inequality holds in support sense. For any $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, let $\gamma_i : (-\epsilon, \epsilon) \times [\tau_1, \tau_2] \to M$, $\gamma_i(r, s) = \exp_{\gamma(s)}(rY_i)$ be a variation of $\gamma$, then

$$Q(\exp_x(rY_i), \tau_1; exp_y(rY_i), \tau_2) \le \mathscr{L}[\gamma_i(r, \cdot)]$$

with equality holds at $r = 0$. So

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{\nabla}^2 Q((Y_i(\tau_1), Y_i(\tau_2)), (Y_i(\tau_1), Y_i(\tau_2)))\\
\le&\frac{d^2}{dr^2}\bigg|_{r=0} \mathscr{L}[\gamma_i(r, \cdot)]\\
=&\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \sqrt{\tau}\bigg[2|\nabla_X Y_i|^2 + 2\langle R(Y_i, X)Y_i, X\rangle + HessR(Y_i, Y_i) + 2\nabla_X Ric(Y_i, Y_i)\\
&- 4\nabla_{Y_i} Ric(Y_i, X)\bigg] d\tau\\
=&\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \sqrt{\tau}\bigg[2| - Ric(Y_i, \cdot) + \frac{1}{2\tau}Y_i|^2 + 2\langle R(Y_i, X)Y_i, X\rangle + HessR(Y_i, Y_i)\\
&+ 2\nabla_X Ric(Y_i, Y_i) - 4\nabla_{Y_i} Ric(Y_i, X)\bigg] d\tau\\
=&\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \sqrt{\tau}\bigg[2|Ric(Y_i, \cdot)|^2 - \frac{2}{\tau}Ric(Y_i, Y_i) + \frac{1}{2\tau} + 2\langle R(Y_i, X)Y_i, X\rangle + HessR(Y_i, Y_i)\\
&+ 2\nabla_X Ric(Y_i, Y_i) - 4\nabla_{Y_i} Ric(Y_i, X)\bigg] d\tau.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{d\tau}Ric(Y_i, Y_i) &= Ric_\tau(Y_i, Y_i) + \nabla_X Ric(Y_i, Y_i) + 2Ric(\nabla_X Y_i, Y_i)\\
&= Ric_\tau(Y_i, Y_i) + \nabla_X Ric(Y_i, Y_i) + \frac{1}{\tau}Ric(Y_i, Y_i) - 2|Ric(Y_i, \cdot)|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\tilde{\nabla}^2 Q((Y_i(\tau_1), Y_i(\tau_2)), (Y_i(\tau_1), Y_i(\tau_2))) \tag{26}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\leq -\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2}\left[2\sqrt{\tau}\frac{d}{d\tau}Ric(Y_i,Y_i)+\frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}}Ric(Y_i,Y_i)\right]d\tau+\frac{1}{2}\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2}\frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}}d\tau\\
&\quad+\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2}\sqrt{\tau}\Big[2\langle R(Y_i,X)Y_i,X\rangle+HessR(Y_i,Y_i)+4\nabla_X Ric(Y_i,Y_i)\\
&\quad-4\nabla_{Y_i}Ric(X,Y_i)+\frac{1}{\tau}Ric(Y_i,Y_i)+2Ric_\tau(Y_i,Y_i)-2|Ric(Y_i,\cdot)|^2\Big]d\tau\\
&=-2\sqrt{\tau}Ric(Y_i,Y_i)\Big|_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2}+\sqrt{\tau}\Big|_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2}-\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2}\sqrt{\tau}H(X,Y_i)d\tau,
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
H(X,Y):=&-2\langle R(Y,X)Y,X\rangle-HessR(Y,Y)-4\nabla_X Ric(Y,Y)\\
&+4\nabla_Y Ric(X,Y)-\frac{1}{\tau}Ric(Y,Y)-2Ric_\tau(Y,Y)+2|Ric(Y,\cdot)|^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Summing over $i$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{D}Q\leq&n\sqrt{\tau}\Big|_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2}-2\tau^{\frac{3}{2}}R\Big|_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2}-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2}\sqrt{\tau}H(X,Y_i)d\tau\\
=&n\sqrt{\tau}\Big|_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2}-2\tau^{\frac{3}{2}}R\Big|_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2}-\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2}\tau^{\frac{3}{2}}H(X)d\tau\\
=&n(\sqrt{\tau_2}-\sqrt{\tau_1})-(2\tau_2^{\frac{3}{2}}R(y,\tau_2)-2\tau_1^{\frac{3}{2}}R(x,\tau_1))-\mathscr{K}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{27}
$$

Now we begin our new proof of Theorem 1.6.

***Proof:*** Let

$$
P(x,y,s)=P(x,\tau_1(s);y,\tau_2(s)):=2(\sqrt{\tau_2}-\sqrt{\tau_1})Q(x,\tau_1;y,\tau_2)-2n(\sqrt{\tau_2}-\sqrt{\tau_1})^2.
$$

If $\gamma(\tau)$ is a shortest $\mathscr{L}$-geodesic connecting $(x,\tau_1)$ and $(y,\tau_2)$, then by (27),

(28)

$$
\mathscr{D}P(x,y,s)\leq 2(\sqrt{\tau_2}-\sqrt{\tau_1})[n(\sqrt{\tau_2}-\sqrt{\tau_1})-(2\tau_2^{\frac{3}{2}}R(y,\tau_2)-2\tau_1^{\frac{3}{2}}R(x,\tau_1))-\mathscr{K}].
$$

On the other hand, by (24),

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d^+}{ds}Q(x,\tau_1;y,\tau_2) &:= \limsup_{h\downarrow 0}\frac{Q(x,\tau_1(s+h);y,\tau_2(s+h))-Q(x,\tau_1(s);y,\tau_2(s))}{h}\\ &\leq \frac{d}{ds}\mathscr{L}(x,\tau_1(s);y,\tau_2(s))\\ &= \tau_1\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau_1}\mathscr{L}(x,\tau_1;y,\tau_2)+\tau_2\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau_2}\mathscr{L}(x,\tau_1;y,\tau_2)\\ &= 2\tau_2^{\frac{3}{2}}R(y,\tau_2)-2\tau_1^{\frac{3}{2}}R(x,\tau_1)+\mathscr{K}-\frac{1}{2}Q(x,\tau_1;y,\tau_2).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(29)\qquad &\frac{d^+}{ds}P(x,y,s)\\ =&2(\sqrt{\tau_2}-\sqrt{\tau_1})(\frac{d^+}{ds}Q(x,\tau_1;y,\tau_2))\\ &+(\sqrt{\tau_2}-\sqrt{\tau_1})Q(x,\tau_1;y,\tau_2)-2n(\sqrt{\tau_2}-\sqrt{\tau_1})^2\\ \leq&2(\sqrt{\tau_2}-\sqrt{\tau_1})[2\tau_2^{\frac{3}{2}}R(y,\tau_2)-2\tau_1^{\frac{3}{2}}R(x,\tau_1)+\mathscr{K}-n(\sqrt{\tau_2}-\sqrt{\tau_1})].\end{aligned}$$

Combining $(28),(29)$, we find

$$(30)\qquad (-\frac{d^+}{ds}-\mathscr{D})P(x,y,s)\geq 0.$$

It is easy to see

$$\Theta(s)=\inf_{\pi\in\Gamma(\nu_1,\nu_2)}\int_{M\times M}P(x,\tau_1(s);y,\tau_2(s))d\pi(x,y)$$

Now we can use Lemma 3.1 and the maximum principle to prove the theorem just as what we have done in the proof of Theorem 1.1. The only difference is that the price functions $\varphi(s,x)$ and $\psi(s,y)$ solve the equation

$$-\frac{\partial}{\partial s}f=\tau(s)\Delta_{g(\tau(s))}f,$$

which is conjugate to the equation

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial s}u=\tau(s)[\Delta_{g(\tau(s))}u+R(x,\tau(s))u].$$

Finally, $(\varphi(s,x),\psi(s,y))$ will be continue to be competitive because of (30) together with the maximum principle.

# References

[1] B.Andrews; J.Clutterbuck. *Lipschitz bounds for solutions of quasilinear parabolic equations in one space variable*, J. Differential Equations, **246** (2009), no. 11, 4268C4283.

[2] B.Andrews; J.Clutterbuck. *Sharp modulus of continuity for parabolic equations on manifolds and lower bounds for the first eigenvalue*, http://arxiv.org/abs/1204.5079.

[3] M.Arnaudon; K.A.Coulibaly; A.Thalmaier. *Horizontal diffusion in $C^1$ path space*, Sminaire de Probabilits XLIII, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, (2011), 73-94.

[4] E.Cabezas-Rivas; P.M.Topping. *The canonical shrinking soliton associated to a Ricci flow*, Calc. Var., **43** (2012), no. 1-2, 173C184.

[5] Huai-Dong Cao; Xi-Ping Zhu. *A complete proof of the Poincar and geometrization conjecturesapplication of the Hamilton-Perelman theory of the Ricci flow*, Asian J. math., **10** (2006), no. 2, 165C492.

[6] B.Kleiner; J.Lott. *Notes on Perelman's Papers*, Geom. Topol., **12** (2008), no. 5, 2587C2855.

[7] K.Kuwada; R.Philipowski. *Coupling of Brownian motions and Perelman's L-functional*, J. Funct. Anal., **260** (2011), no. 9, 2742C2766.

[8] J.Lott. *Optimal transport and Perelman's reduced volume*, Calc. Var., **36** (2009), 49C84.

[9] J.Lott; C.Villani. *Ricci curvature for metric-measure spaces via optimal transport*, Ann. of Math., **169** (2009), no. 3, 903C991.

[10] R.J.McCann; P.M.Topping. *Ricci flow, entropy and optimal transportation*, Amer. J. Math., **132** (2010), no. 3, 711C730.

[11] G.Perelman. *The entropy formula for the Ricci flow and its geometric applications.*, http://arXiv.org/abs/math/0211159v1, (2002).

[12] M.-K.von Renesse; K.-T.Sturm. *Transport inequalities, gradient estimates, entropy and Ricci curvature*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **58** (2005), 923-940.

[13] K.-T.Sturm. *On the geometry of metric measure spaces I and II*, Acta. Math., **196** (2006), 65C131 and 133C177.

[14] P.M.Topping. *L-optimal transportation for Ricci flow*, J. Reine Angew. Math., **636** (2009), 93C122.

[15] C.Villani. *Topics in optimal transportation*, Grad. Stud. Math., **58** (2003).